

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MOHAMMAD MUKATI,
Plaintiff,
vs.
JOHN DOE, ET AL.,
Defendants.

CASE NO. 17-cv-07093-YGR

**ORDER RE: REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF
DEFAULT**

Re: Dkt. No. 32

The Court is in receipt of plaintiff's request for entry of default against the 445 defendant domain names at issue in this litigation. (Dkt. No. 32 ("Request").) In his request, plaintiff notes the following:

On January 30, 2018, the Court entered an Order directing service by publication in the Legal Notices section of the *Los Angeles Times* on February 2, 2018, and February 9, 2018. . . . Plaintiff caused to have published in the Legal Notices section of the *Los Angeles Times* a notification of the action on February 2, 2018, and February 9, 2018. Plaintiff filed its proof of service by publication herewith. . . . On February 13, 2018, Plaintiff filed a proof of service by postal [sic] and email as to all of the domains. Accordingly, service pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d) was deemed completed on such date.

(Request ¶¶ 3–5 (citations omitted).)

The service by publication referenced above pertained only to the five domain names over which Namecheap, Inc. is allegedly the registrant. (*See* Dkt. No. 27 ("The Los Angeles Times is deemed an effective method for notice by publication, *because five of the allegedly stolen domain names have been transferred to Namecheap, Inc.*, located in Los Angeles.") (emphasis supplied); *see also* Dkt. No. 30-2 (specifically referencing only five domain names).) Thus, plaintiff's statement regarding the proof of service filed on February 13, 2018 appears to suggest that the remaining 438 domain names at issue in this case were served by mail and email. The Court, however, is unable to discern based on the face of the proof of service (Dkt. No. 28) that service


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

was in fact effectuated as to the 438 remaining domain names.

Without additional information, the Court cannot grant the request as framed. Thus, plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED** to address the Court’s concerns regarding service of process and shall file a written response by no later than **Wednesday, March 28, 2018**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 21, 2018


YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE